



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON THE NAME יהוה.

BY GEORGE F. MOORE

III. THE PRONUNCIATION JAHVOH*

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was the prevailing opinion among scholars who rejected the mixed form *Jehovah* that the Jews pronounced the name *Jahvoh*. The origin and history of this almost forgotten opinion are instructive.

In the controversy about the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton which was started by Drusius' monograph in 1604, the testimony of Theodoret was early adduced. In two of his works, *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* and *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium*, that Father, after explaining that the Jews were forbidden to utter the name, tells how the Samaritans pronounced it and what the Jews said. In the edition of the *Quaestiones* which was in the hands of scholars at the beginning of the seventeenth century¹ the text ran as follows: καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμαρεῖται μὲν Ἰαβέ, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἰά.² Drusius (1604) boldly emended Ἰὰ to Ἰάω [sic],³ thus bringing it into conformity with Diodorus Siculus (i, 94) and other ancient statements that the god of the Jews was named Ἰάω. Drusius' *pedisequus*, Sixtinus Amama (1628), adopted the emendation without citing the reading of the edition.⁴ Cappellus (1624) quotes Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ Ἰάω as the actual words of Theodoret, adding, "nihil manifestius aut expressius dici potuit."⁵ Henceforth Theodoret was regularly cited as a witness that Ἰάω was the specifically Jewish pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton as Ἰαβέ was the Samaritan.⁶

* See *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, I, 143-64 = *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. XII (1908), 34-52. It need hardly be said that these notes make no pretense of completeness. A methodical search, if it were worth the time, would doubtless add many names to those here cited.

¹ Ed. Jo. Picus, Paris, 1558; Picus also published a Latin translation (Paris, 1563).

² *Quaest.* xv in *Exod.*

³ *Decas exercitationum*, ed. Reland, pp. 62 f., 64.

⁴ *Decas*, p. 206.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 316.

⁶ Clericus (on *Exod.* 3:14), comparing Ἰάω, gives the pronunciation *Jahavoh* or *Jahvoh*, a form like יהוה, פְּרִיעָה; he expressly rejects *Jeheveh* and *Jihveh*.

Sirmond, in his edition of the complete works of Theodoret (1642), replaced the 'Ià of the editio princeps of the *Quaestiones* by 'Aïà, which is in all probability what Theodoret wrote;⁷ but by that time the transmission of the quotation had become altogether independent of editions of the text. Thus Drusius' conjecture, 'Iáo—a conjecture superficially plausible but on second consideration wholly indefensible, like so many "obvious" emendations—established itself in the learned tradition, and passed unchallenged for two centuries.

Assuming that 'Iáo represented the Jewish pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, the question arose what the corresponding Hebrew form was. 'Iáo might stand for *Jaho*, יהוה, like גְּדוֹל, קָדוֹשׁ, and the proper nouns יִלּוֹן, יִדּוֹן; or for *Jahvo*. The latter, supported by 'Ievó, quoted by Porphyry from Sanchuniathon, was regarded as the more probable alternative. *Jahvo* would naturally be written in Hebrew יהוה (or, with a negligible surreptitious syllable, יהוה). There is no example of an imperfect of a ל"ה verb ending in *o*, but the proper names פְּרוֹעַ, יַעֲקֹב, were compared, and, more speciously, יְהוֹדִי (I Chron. 5:14), which was explained by Cappellus as a variant spelling for יהוה from the ל"ה verb הוה. Another theory was that 'Iáo *Jahvo* stood for יהוה, the original *a* being modified to *o* "as in אָרָם *óδóμ*, לֵךְ *lecho*."⁸ Although not entirely unaware of the grammatical difficulties, the "Jahvohists" of the seventeenth century contented themselves with one or the other of these explanations, or with leaving open the choice between them.

The scholars of the eighteenth century contributed nothing further. Toward its close, Wahl and Scheid are cited for יהוה.⁹

⁷ Sirmond based his text of the *Quaestiones* on a manuscript in the Royal Library in Paris. Cod. August., collated by Schulze, has 'Iá, as in Picus' edition. 'Aïà is supported by the extract from Theodoret in the *Catena Nicephori* on Exod. 3:15, and by the parallel in Theodoret's *Haeret. Fabul. Compend.*, v, 3, where 'Aïà has been the reading of all the editions from the first (Rome, 1547). The earliest Latin translation, also, appears to have had *Aïa*, in which form the testimony is quoted in the sixteenth century. Modern scholars have rightly recognized that 'Aïà is not יהוה but אֱהִיָּה (Exod. 3:14), which the Jews regarded as one of the sacred names of God, but not unutterable. In the Paris magical papyrus (Wessely, 3019) it stands beside other names of God: ὁρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων Ἰησοῦ · ιαβα · ιαη · αβραωθ · αϊα κ. τ. λ. (יהוה, יי, . . . אהיה).

⁸ See Drusius, *Decas*, p. 64; Amama, p. 236; Cappellus, 312, 317 f.; Clericus, on Exod. 3:16. On *o* for *χ*ameg in Jerome's transliteration of Hebrew names see Siegfried, *ZATW.* IV (1884), 75.

⁹ Winer, *Lexicon*, 1828, s. v.

Gesenius, in the first edition of his *Handwörterbuch* (1810), gives יהוה "oder ähnliches," and in 1823 could still say that most scholars read it in that way. Knobel,¹⁰ while denying that 'Iáw gave the true pronunciation of the name, thought that it had probably arisen through the incorrect formation of an imperfect יהוה or יהוה (after the analogy of יהלך and other פ"י verbs), perhaps influenced by confusion with the "Phoenician" god 'Iáw, of whom Movers had recently made much. Delitzsch,¹¹ arguing against the "Samaritan" pronunciation *Jahveh*, adduces the testimony of Theodoret, "dass die jüdische Aussprache anders lautet, nämlich 'Aíd (nach a. LA 'Iá), und dieses 'Aíd, nach anderer Gräcisirung (die den dunklen *a*- Laut des Kamez wiedergibt) 'Iaó [sic], entspricht dem hebr. יהוה, welches sich auch dadurch als die rechte Aussprache bestätigt, dass ausnahmslos alle von Futuris des Kal der Vv. לה abgeleiteten Eigennamen nicht auf *eh*, sondern auf *ah* auslauten" (cf. ימנה, etc.).¹² The last defender of *Jahävoh* was Lenormant, who wrote: "Les remarques philologiques les plus ingénieuses en faveur de la vocalisation יהוה, qui l'ont fait adopter par les savants de l'école allemande, ne me paraissent pas pouvoir prévaloir contre le témoignage formel de Théodoret (*Quaest. xv in Exod.*) disant que les Samaritains prononçaient יהוה et les Juifs יהוה: Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ Σαμαρεῖται 'Iaβέ, 'Ioudaioi δὲ 'Iaó [sic], et contre le masse de passages de toute origine, aussi bien profane (Diod. Sic., i, 94) que sacrée, qui affirment la prononciation 'Iaò ou *Iaho*."¹³ Lenormant cites Bellermann, *Ueber die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxas-Bilde*, II (1818), 38 ff., from whom in fact most of his wisdom, including the quotation from Theodoret, is derived; Bellermann, however, pronounces יהוה, like Adon, Jadon, Jalon, etc.

¹⁰ *Kurzgefasstes exeget. Handbuch*, on Exod. 3:14 (1857).

¹¹ *Psalmen*, I, viii f. (1859).

¹² Köhler, *De Pronunciatione sacros. Tetragrammatis* (1867)^o follows Delitzsch (Schrader, *Bibel-Lexikon*, III, 168). In more recent times Sayce (*Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, 87) prefers "Yahävah" to *Yahveh*, because of the Babylonian contract tablets on which occur names of Jews compounded with Ya(h)ava(h). So, on the same grounds, Ball (*Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, 2d ed., II, 1553). Delitzsch was convinced of his error by letters of Dietrich in 1861 and 1866, which Delitzsch published in the *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft*, III (1883), 280-98.

¹³ *Lettres assyriologiques*, II (1872), 192 f.

It should be superfluous to add that 'Iáw does not represent יְהוָה, but the form יְהוּ, now amply attested in Aramaic papyri.

IV. THE PRONUNCIATION JAHVEH

In the discussion of this pronunciation I include the variations *Jahāveh* and *Jehveh*, *Jehēveh*. The apparently trisyllabic forms, which originate in the phonetic notation of the slight vowel sound that may accompany either a slovenly or an over-distinct utterance of the *h*, may be dismissed as having no further significance. *Jehveh*, however, is an alternative pronunciation having good analogy; some scholars have given it the preference over *Jahveh*, while others decline to pronounce between them.¹⁴

In the imperfect of the simple stem, verbs beginning with a so-called guttural consonant and ending in a vowel (ל"ו) exhibit the following forms: יַעֲטָה, יַעֲדָה; יַעֲנָה, יַעֲנָה; יַהֲנָה, יַהֲנָה. Closer analysis shows that these variations are not quite indifferent—the nature of the guttural and the position of the stress being recognizable factors—though they can hardly be reduced to a uniform rule; but the older grammarians made no exhaustive classification of the phenomena and paid no attention to phonetic considerations. *Jehveh* (יְהוֹה) had, on the whole, the better support in such forms as יַהֲנָה, יַהֲנָה; and, what was of greater weight, it had for it the analogy of אָהֳרָה in Exod. 3:15.¹⁵ The testimony of the Church Fathers who wrote the name 'Iaouè¹⁶ or 'Iaβè¹⁷ was not irreconcilable with יְהוֹה, as appears from הַבֵּל Αβελ, גִּזְרִי Γαζερ, אֲרָץ araz, הָרֵס | הרס ares, הָרֵב areb, etc. The Hebrew sound represented in the common notation as ׀ must in fact have been comparatively close to that represented by ׀ (compare English *mat*, *met*), since the supralinear system does not distinguish them. On the other hand the forms יְהוֹה, יְהוֹה, at the beginning of compound proper names, and יְהוֹה, יְהוֹה, at the end, presuppose יְהוֹה.

¹⁴ In the earlier discussions it is generally assumed that the name יְהוָה was derived from the simple stem of הוה; from the causative stem, יְהוֹה alone was possible.

¹⁵ Jacob, *Im Namen Gottes*, p. 168, prefers יְהוֹה, in which he sees a regularly formed Aramaic imperfect.

¹⁶ Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, v, 6.

¹⁷ Epiphanius, *Adv. Haereses*, i, 3, 20[40]; Theodoret, *ll. cc.*

The first, so far as I know, to suggest the pronunciation *Jahveh* was Genebrardus,¹⁸ who, after inveighing against the new and ignorant pronunciation *Jehovah*, gives it as his opinion that, if the true pronunciation be not irrecoverably lost, it is *Ihué* [יְהוֹה], or *Iahué*, in support of which he adduces the shortened form *Jah* and Theodoret's statement that the Samaritans pronounced 'Iaβaí [ʿIaβé]. Mercerus would pronounce יְהוֹה, after the analogy of אֱהוֹה in Exod. 3:15. Arias Montanas infers from the analogy of similar nouns that it should be pronounced *Jeveh*.¹⁹ Similarly Cornelius a Lapide (†1637). Scaliger recognized that Theodoret's 'Iaβè represents יְהוֹה or יְהוֹה, ὁ ὦν.²⁰

Drusius himself, the inventor of *Jahvoh*, would, on grammatical grounds, prefer the form which Theodoret attributes to the Samaritans, 'Iaβé, i. e., יְהוֹה, "vel certe יְהוֹה, quod antiquitus legebant *Jave* . . . ut פִּסְגָּה *Phasga*," etc.²¹ "Est autem יְהוֹה idem plane cum יְהוֹה."²² Mutatio facta, ut aliquod esset discrimen inter verbum futuri temporis et nomen proprium Dei. Sic est profecto, Deus se vocat אֱהוֹה *sum*: nos dicimus יְהוֹה et יְהוֹה *est*, vel יְהוֹה." Amama repeats and defends his master.²³ Gusset, in his *Lexicon* (1702; 2d ed. Clodius, 1743), has a clear and sensible treatment of the subject, criticizing Cappellus' *Jahvoh*: "porro genuinam prolationem fuisse putem cum Placaeo²⁴ יְהוֹה aut יְהוֹה, retentis futuri verbi sonis, ut in אֱהוֹה nomine simul tradito . . . retinentur."²⁵

Thus from the middle of the sixteenth century there was a succession of eminent scholars who regarded *Jahveh*, or more commonly *Jehveh*, as the true pronunciation of the name.²⁶

It is a widespread opinion that the pronunciation *Jahveh* was introduced by Ewald (1803–1875), if not first proposed by him,²⁷

¹⁸ *Chronologia* (1567); ed. Paris, 1600, pp. 79 f.

¹⁹ For fuller quotations from these scholars, see *Old Test. and Semitic Studies*, I, 156 f.

²⁰ *De Emend. Temp.*, ed. 1598. Append., Vet. Graec. Fragm. Select. 33.

²¹ *Decas*, 64 f. In his *Annotaciones* on Exod. 3, he gives יְהוֹה also as a possibility.

²² Represented by the Jewish pronunciation *Javo*.

²³ *Decas*, p. 236.

²⁴ The Saumur theologian, La Place, 1651.

²⁵ Zeltner (†1736), in his *Enneas quaest. philol.* (1747), p. 34^o, pronounced יְהוֹה.

²⁶ At the end of the eighteenth century, J. D. Michaelis (*Supplementa*, I, 524) thinks it necessary expressly to refute this view.

²⁷ See, e. g., *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (III), 3321.

and this error threatens to become as inveterate as that Galatinus was the first to pronounce *Jehovah*, with less excuse because the evidence to the contrary is accessible to every scholar.

The lexicon in general use in Germany in the latter part of the eighteenth century was that of I. Simon (1752; 2d ed., 1771). Simon defended the pronunciation *Jehovah*, which he regarded as representing the three tenses of יהוה = היה. The third edition of Simonis Lexicon (1793) was revised by J. G. Eichhorn, who, in the first paragraphs of the article יהוה (p. 423), set forth his own opinion as follows: “יהוה nomen proprium Dei, a Mose demum introductum, *eum, qui re praestitutus sit, quod olim promiserit*, ex ipsa loci Mosaici authentica explicatione Exod. 3, 14, significans, adeoque יהוה vel יהוה proprie efferendum, ut ex veteribus Theodoretus et Epiphanius *Jabe* h. e. *Jave* scripserunt.” (Under יה [p. 681] he writes יהוה.)²⁸ Gesenius, who in the first edition of his *Handwörterbuch* (1810) gives as the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton “יהוה or the like,” in his smaller lexicon of 1815 decides unqualifiedly for יהוה, which appeared in all subsequent editions of the *Handwörterbuch* (2d ed. 1823, 3d ed. 1828), as also in the *Lexicon Manuale* (1833) and the *Thesaurus* (II, i, 1839). The pronunciation יהוה was made familiar to English students by Gibbs’s translation of Gesenius (1824), Leo’s (1825), and Robinson’s (1836).

Ewald was a student in Göttingen from 1820–1823 pursuing the oriental languages under Eichhorn and Tychsen. In 1823 he published his first work, *Die Komposition der Genesis*, in which he rejects the etymological connection with היה (איהיה), and continues (p. 10): “Eben so wenig folgt aus der Stelle [Exod. 3:14 f.], dass יהוה eigentlich יהוה ausgesprochen werden müsste, wie noch neulich nach Zeltneri *Enneas quaest. philol.* (Lips. 1747) p. 34 behauptet ist.” Zeltner is cited by Eichhorn who also, as will be seen from the quotation above, argues that Exod. 3:15 indicates the true pronunciation יהוה. If the words “noch neulich” were to be pressed, we might infer that Ewald was referring to Gesenius (1815); but such phrases are used with

²⁸ Winer, in the fourth edition of Simon (1828), says that the learned are divided between יהוה, יהוה, and יהוה, and leaves the question undecided.

considerable latitude, and it may be Eichhorn that he is refuting. The important thing is that יְהוָה had established itself in the two dictionaries which were in the hands of all scholars in Germany, one of them published ten years before Ewald was born, the other in the year in which he entered the gymnasium, and that in 1823 he went out of his way to reject that pronunciation. In his *Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache* (1828), however, though he uses *Jehova* throughout, he writes (p. 220): "יְהוָה (wahrscheinl. eig. יְהוֹה);" in the second edition of the *Grammatik* (1835), he uses *Jahve*, and writes (p. 216): "יְהוָה (יְהוֹה punctirt)."

The pronunciation *Jahveh* was maintained on conclusive grammatical grounds by Hitzig in 1833 (*Jesaia*, p. 4); Vatke accepted it in 1835 (*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 670); Hengstenberg in 1839 elaborately defended it (*Beiträge*, II, 204 ff.).²⁹ Ewald's relation to the matter is thus accurately stated by Schrader:³⁰ "Ewald, in seiner Jugendschrift: 'Ueber die Composition der Genesis' (Braunschweig, 1823) noch die Aussprache Jehovah in Schutz nehmend, hat sich später entschieden für die Aussprache Jahve erklärt und ist der erste gewesen, der des Namens Jahve in seinen Schriften, namentlich auch in seinen Uebersetzungen alttest. Bücher, durchgehends und consequent sich bedient hat."

In other words, what Ewald did was not to suggest or prove that the true pronunciation of the name was *Jahveh*, but to use it constantly in translation and in his own writings, where his predecessors, out of concession to established custom, had employed *Jehovah*.

²⁹ See also E. Meier, *Theol. Jahrbücher*, I (1842), 473 ff.; Caspari, *Micha* (1852), p. 5 ff.

³⁰ *Bibel-Lexikon*, III (1871), 167.